

MINUTES
Superintendent's Advisory Committee
Public Schools Accountability Act of
1999

General Services Building
1325 J Street, Room 1519
Sacramento, CA 95814
March 20, 2000
1:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Holly Covin, Acting Chair; Assistant Executive Director, Policy Analysis & Research, CSBA
Vicki Barber, El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools
Sue Burr, Undersecretary, Office of the Secretary for Education
Mary Alice Callahan, President, Morgan Hill Federation of Teachers
General Davie, Jr., Superintendent, San Juan Unified School District
Ed Haertel, Professor, Stanford University, School of Education
Jere Jacobs, Former Assistant Vice President, Pacific Telesis
Kelvin Lee, Superintendent, Dry Creek Joint Elementary School
Sidney Morrison, Principal, Arnold Elementary School/ACSA State President
Lynette Nyaggah, Teacher, Rio Hondo College
Jeff Orlinsky, Teacher, Warren High School
Tamara Powers, Parent
Ernesto Ruiz, Director, Migrant Education, Region 2, Butte County Office of Education
Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Los Angeles COE
Rosie Thompson, Business Unit Executive, IBM Global Education
Charles Weis, Ventura County Superintendent of Schools
Lynn Wilen, Superintendent, Reef Sunset Unified School District

MEMBERS ABSENT

Sam Araki, Former President, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Space
Eva Baker, Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles
Tom Boysen, Senior Vice President, Education, Milken Family Foundation
Rudy Castruita, San Diego County Superintendent of Schools
Leslie DeMersseman, Immediate Past President, California School Boards Association
Patsy Estrellas, Teacher, Norwalk La Mirada School District/California Teachers Association
Bob Friedman, Chief Operations Officer, CSIS
Javier Gonzales, Teacher, Pioneer High School
Jerry Hayward, Director, Policy Analysis for California Education
Janett Humphries, President, SEIU Local 99, Los Angeles Unified School District
Cecelia Mansfield, California State PTA

Dolores Ochoa, Parent, State Parent Advisory Board
Bill Ouchi, Vice-Dean, Anderson School, University of California at Los Angeles
Pat Pineda, Co-Chair; Vice President, Legal, Environmental, and Government Affairs,
NUMMI
Scott Plotkin, Chief Consultant and Staff Director, Senate Education Committee
Irene Sumida, Co-Director, Fenton Avenue Charter School
Rene Townsend, Professor/Consultant, CSU San Marcos, College of Education

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION LIAISONS

Marian Bergeson (Present)
Susan Hammer (Absent)

PRINCIPAL STAFF TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Padia, Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation
Pat McCabe, Manager, Education Planning and Information Center
Wendy Harris, Director, Educational Support Networks Division

Call to Order: Ms. Covin called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

Introductions: Ms. Covin invited the members, staff, and audience to introduce themselves.

Organizational Matters: Mr. Padia reviewed the March 10, 2000 letter to district superintendents from Leslie Fausset, Chief Deputy Superintendent. He solicited comments and stated the department will be coming out with a revised similar schools rank. He reviewed the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the State Board of Education (SBE) adopt a minimum student participation rate of 95% for the STAR assessment as an eligibility criterion for the two awards programs. He concluded his review by explaining schools self-identify themselves as "alternative" using the CDE school designation code. Schools identified as "alternative" who want to participate in the accountability system to receive an API must formally request to do so with CDE. He also stated that SB 1x includes charter schools in the main accountability system.

II/USP Report: Ms. Covin invited Mr. Davie to report on the work of the II/USP Subcommittee. Mr. Davie reported the subcommittee developed an outline for a proposed letter to the field regarding the importance of an II/USP action plan implementation to avoid sanctions. He handed the letter to committee members and proceeded to present key points including:

- Individuals to be contacted
- Informal actions and preventative measures
- District interventions
- Resources

Mr. Davie noted that the subcommittee looked at sanctions as described in the law and decided they did not want to articulate anything in addition to the law.

Ms. Covin asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding the letter. The committee approved the letter.

Evaluation Report: Ms. Covin invited Mr. Weis to present an update on the Evaluation Subcommittee. Mr. Weis responded to a query from Ms. Barber related to External Evaluators. He stated the State Board approved the guidelines for the External Evaluators late last summer. Ms. Harris, Director, Educational Support Networks Division added that the California Department of Education (CDE) planned to continue to ask for assistance from the counties. In addition, CDE planned to survey a sampling of schools regarding the External Evaluators process. Mr. Weis summarized February's Board item to the committee which included the Guidelines for an RFP for an Independent Evaluation of SB 1x. The SBE approved the Guidelines as presented.

Awards Report:

Ms. Covin reported that the State Board of Education (SBE) did not receive for information the committee's March Board item, Report of the Advisory Committee on the PSAA Options for the Implementation of the Certificated Staff Performance Incentive Act, AB 1114. She stated the Governor wants to give some awards in the maximum amount of \$25,000 per full-time equivalent certificated staff member, an option not present in the committee's report. CDE staff will work with staff from the Secretary of Education's Office to develop various scenarios for the Governor's consideration.

Ms. Covin invited Mr. Lee to present the report of the Awards Subcommittee, "Options for the Implementation of the Governor's Performance Award Program." Mr. Lee referred to the committee to the draft document dated March 15, 2000. He provided the following comments on each of the twelve issues as outlined in the document.

Issue 1: Should there be a minimum participation rate in STAR for a school to be eligible to receive an award under the GPAP, and if so, what should the rate be?

Mr. Lee stated that the committee felt strongly that as many students as possible take the test.

The subcommittee agreed upon the following formula to determine percent participation:

% Participation = $\frac{\text{Total students tested}}{\text{Enrollment in grades tested minus parent waivers, minus IEP exemptions}}$

The subcommittee recommends a minimum STAR participation rate of 95% for year 2000.

Issue 2: What should the criteria be for cases where STAR data used to calculate comparable improvement are inconsistent with other CDE data?

Mr. Lee stated the subcommittee felt that this problem has sorted itself out and was no longer a significant issue.

Issue 3: If a school's grade level configuration or Country-District-School (CDS) code changes from 1999 to 2000, what eligibility criteria for awards should be used?

Mr. Lee noted that schools are supposed to report configuration changes. Currently there are no criteria for applying for a CDS code, but CDE will be looking at that.

Issue 4: Should a school that did not receive an API in 1999 be considered for awards in 2000 if its 2000 API and 2000 subgroup API(s) meet certain criteria?

Issue 5: If a 1999 subgroup API is not calculated for a school but a 2000 API is calculated, should it be considered "meeting the subgroups growth target" if (1) the 2000 subgroup API is 800 or more or (2) if the school wide growth meets or exceeds a higher target?

Mr. Lee noted that the subcommittee did not discuss issues 4 or 5.

Issue 6: Should the GPAP funding for schools be calculated on a per school or per pupil basis?

Mr. Lee reported that the subcommittee recommended that awards go to the highest performing schools first. A recommendation was put forth suggesting 20% of the funds be awarded at \$150 per pupil, 30% at \$100 and 50% at \$50. In addition, it was recommended that all schools achieving at or above 5% of their growth target and demonstrating comparable improvement receive a non-monetary award.

Issue 7: Assuming comparable improvement criteria are met, should schools maintaining an API of 800 or above receive cash awards or only those at 800 or above that have made positive gains in the API? If cash awards are only for schools at 800 or above that have made positive gains, by how much must one grow to receive a cash award?

Mr. Lee noted the subcommittee recommended that these schools should have access to cash awards if their absolute gains on the API are sufficiently high.

Issue 8: Should there be an escalating schedule for monetary awards?

Mr. Lee reported the subcommittee agreed there should be an escalating schedule for monetary awards.

Issue 9: Should award funds be reserved until data problems are resolved? If so, how much should be reserved, for how long should it be reserved, and how long should any left over funds be used?

Mr. Lee stated the subcommittee recommended establishment of a 10% reserve of the total amount. The recommendation was to hold 10% of the funded \$96 million dollars until all data problems were resolved.

Issue 10: Who at the schools should decide how cash awards are to be spent?

Mr. Lee stated the recommendation was to distribute by a mutually agreed upon governance group or a school site council at the site.

Issue 11: What should the non-monetary awards consist of and what should the eligibility criteria be for each type of award?

Mr. Lee noted that once a school reached the 5% target and demonstrated comparable improvement, the school would be recognized. If a school missed out on the cash award,

the school could be eligible for the CSRP. Non-monetary awards could include flags, banners, pins, and use of an award program state logo to be used on school letterhead representing exemplary performance for that particular year.

Issue 12: For the categorical waivers and expenditure flexibility specified in the PSAA, should regulations be developed, and if so, by when? What is meant by "significant growth" for schools to receive maximum flexibility in expenditure of categorical funding?

Mr. Lee reported the subcommittee recommended that if a school was at or above the 5% level and demonstrated comparable improvement, a school could request the SBE to waive program requirements for certain categorical programs (EC section 52057(d)). For EC section 52057(e) where a school would automatically be granted "maximum expenditure flexibility" the subcommittee recommended that "significant growth" be defined as either (1) meeting or exceeding the 5% growth target or (2) an API at or above 800. In both cases, the school must demonstrate comparable improvement. This expenditure flexibility would be granted for three consecutive years.

Mr. Padia stated that staff will further investigate this issue.

Ms. Covin expressed a wish to go back over the issues one by one and make sure all committee members understood the recommendations. She pointed out to committee members there would be no control over parents who opt out their children from the assessment if the committee recommended the proposed formula. She opened up the subcommittee's Issue One recommendation for discussion.

Mr. Weis stated there are a lot of reasons that parents choose to "opt children out". One reason was to prepare the children for the SAT test, which was administered around the same time as the STAR program. He added there are some instances where parents are being solicited to opt their child out of taking the test.

Mr. Orlinsky asked, "Will schools qualify if they tested less than 95% during the 1999?"

Mr. McCabe responded "Schools will qualify if they tested at least 95% of the students during the 2000 school year."

Ms. Covin addressed Issue Two, regarding the monetary awards and the funding for schools. She reminded members \$96 million was appropriated and data simulations project that about 3,800 schools may be eligible. She stated Sue Burr, Interim Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Education, made it very clear to the committee that Governor Gray Davis wanted to see the allocation be set at the maximum \$150 per student. She pointed out the subcommittee was focused on creating three groups: 20% of the funds be allocated at the \$150 level, 30% at the \$100 level and 50% at the \$50 level.

Ms. Spiegel-Coleman stated she would like to see information regarding this issue get out to the schools as soon as possible.

Ms. Thompson agreed with Ms. Spiegel-Coleman.

Mr. Ruiz suggested the committee recommend allocating 10% of the funds at the \$150 level.

Ms. Nyaggah asked, "What would the distribution look like if we change the \$150 award be changed to 10%?"

There was considerable discussion about the possible percentage levels for the distribution of award funds.

A question was asked if the intent of the program was to give small awards for many schools or large awards to few schools. Mr. Hartel and Mr. McCabe gave some estimates.

Ms. Covin noted committee members responses to the estimates and stated, "I am hearing that we stay at 20/30/50 recommendation".

Ms. Covin asked, "Who should decide how the cash awards are to be spent? The committee is saying that the school site or similar governance group should make the decision". Committee members agreed with the recommendation.

Ms. Covin, seeing agreement with the committee, moved onto the issue regarding non-monetary awards. She stated, "The committee is recommending to award a banner and use of a symbol or logo for the year the school demonstrates growth."

Committee members agreed with the recommendation.

Ms. Covin reminded members the last issue dealt with EC sections 50257 (d) and (e). She repeated the subcommittee's recommendation that schools that achieve the 5% growth targets may apply for the waiver under EC section 52057(d). She clarified the recommendation for schools demonstrating "significant growth" as defined as 10% growth or an API at or above 800 (assuming comparable improvement is also met). Schools achieving "significant growth" receive automatic spending flexibility. This flexibility will last three years and continue as long as the school shows "significant growth." In an attempt to create continuity, it is recommended that if a school does not show significant growth for the second year, but shows significant growth the third year, it may continue with the flexibility.

There were no additional comments from committee members. Ms. Covin stated that the awards subcommittee recommendations would go forth.

Alternative Accountability Report:

Ms. Covin invited Ms. Barber to give the Alternative Accountability report. Ms. Barber referred to the March 1, 2000 document, "Alternative Accountability System Guiding Principles."

Ms. Barber stated, the subcommittee recommended making changes with the following guiding principles:

Principle #3, add language of what should be examples.

Principle #6, deals with mobility issues.

In addition, the subcommittee had three additional items they wished to incorporate into the principles:

Significant improvement

Time in classroom

Dealing with accommodations and how does that impacts the system.

Ms. Barber noted the subcommittee discussed the question, "Should schools with less than 100 students be recognized?" She stated the subcommittee talked this morning about aggregating schools countywide. She said the subcommittee saw that idea as being of no value. She added, most of the small schools have expressed an interest in participating in the API. She added that the technical design group stated we can go down to 65 students each year for two years and still have valid statistics. By including schools with 65-100 students, we are able to take care of about half the small groups schools. She concluded by stating there might be some small schools with populations of less than 65 students that will not be able to participate.

Ms. Barber noted the subcommittee also discussed charter schools. She stated they would fall under the API.

Ms. Barber stated the subcommittee recommended that there no need to impose an accountability system on special education schools that are working with life skills programs. These types of special education schools already had their own accountability system. She continued by stating that the committee believed that the schools operating under regular education curriculum programs should be given the same expectations as the regular education schools. This third type of school would be measured by an alternative accountability system.

Ms. Barber stated the subcommittee felt that an alternative school should be defined as having a population different than the general population and needing to have a different accountability system. The subcommittee defined the schools using an alternative accountability system as:

Juvenile court schools, community day schools, community court schools, and continuation schools.

Ms. Barber added the subcommittee believed that all schools may opt into the API.

Ms. Barber concluded her report by stating the subcommittee would be writing up the revisions for the guiding principles and would like the thinking from the Governor's office to see if the subcommittee was heading down the right course.

Ms. Barber reminded members the next meeting will be scheduled June 23, 2000. Subcommittees will meet in the morning, and reconvene as a full committee in the afternoon.

Public Comments: Ms. Covin asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

Adjournment: Ms. Covin adjourned the meeting at 3:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Seabourne,
Recording Secretary